



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which grew the usual forms $\mathfrak{F} \approx 3$; and thus, with a new \bar{o} -sound, a new symbol arose. As the old o -sign, \mathfrak{X} , had in many cases, particularly in its very name, acquired the sound \bar{o} , it was natural that the new sign for \bar{o} should come to be used for all cases of long and short o .

The more or less parallel changes in the sounds and their signs may be roughly represented as follows:—

\mathfrak{F}	\mathfrak{F}	\mathfrak{F}	
$a \bar{a}$	$*\mathfrak{F}$	\mathfrak{F}	
	$*a\bar{a}$	\bar{a}	
\mathfrak{F}	\mathfrak{F}	\mathfrak{F}	\mathfrak{F}
$\bar{a}n$	$*\mathfrak{F}$	\mathfrak{F}	\bar{o}
	$*\bar{o}$	$*\bar{o}$	

In both of these, the intermediate form alone is conjectural; and, for that matter, the intermediate forms of the sounds too are of course conjectural. Moreover, the conjectured ligatures are such as would be perfectly natural and are in character identical with other runic blendings.

At first thought one might expect that as a new character arose it would get the new name. On the contrary the old name in each case went to the new rune, and this for the simple reason that the sound of the vowel in the old name resembled that represented by the new rune more than it did that from which the latter was differentiated, and which was thus left to get a name beginning with its sound. That 'æsc' was chosen was natural: in the first place, the number of simple nouns beginning with this sound was limited, and the influence of the runic names 'beorc,' 'cēn,' and 'þorn' is obvious. But \mathfrak{F} did not get its new name until it ceased to represent both long and short a and stood for \bar{a} only, being thus recognized as a rune distinct from \mathfrak{F} , to which it resigned the old name 'ans' or 'āns.' When this name became \mathfrak{F} and so no longer represented the sound of \mathfrak{F} , it became associated, as shown above, with the new character \mathfrak{F} , and \mathfrak{F} was named 'āc.' The choice of a name with $\bar{a} < a\bar{a}$ was not due to the origin of \mathfrak{F} in \mathfrak{F} (which must have been quite out of

mind), but to the almost absolute lack of nouns beginning with stressed \bar{a} and to the analogy of 'æsc,' 'beorc,' 'cēn,' and 'þorn.' Disregarding the conjectured forms the chief stages may be represented as follows:—

\mathfrak{F}	$\{\mathfrak{F}\}$	$\{\mathfrak{F}\}$	\mathfrak{X}
$a \bar{a}$	$\{a\bar{a}\}$	$\{an\}$	$\bar{o} o$
'ans'			'ōðil'
\mathfrak{F}	\mathfrak{F}		
$\bar{a} a$	\bar{a}	$\{ \}$	"
'ans'			
\mathfrak{F}	\mathfrak{F}	$\{\mathfrak{F}\}$	"
\bar{a}	$a \bar{a}$	$\{an\}$	
'æsc'	'āns'		
"	\mathfrak{F}	\mathfrak{F}	"
	$a \bar{a}$	\bar{o}	
	'āc'	$\bar{o}s$	
"	"	$\bar{o} o$	\mathfrak{X}
		'ōs'	'æðel'

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

ENGLISH LEXICOGRAPHY.

ON page vi of the introduction to *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* edited by James A. H. Murray, the following is said in regard to its aims:

"The aim of this Dictionary is to furnish an adequate account of the meaning, origin, and history of English words now in general use, or known to have been in use at any time during the last seven hundred years. It endeavours (1) to show, with regard to each individual word, when, how, in what shape, and with what signification, it became English; what development of form and meaning it has since received, which of its uses have, in the course of time, become obsolete, and which still survive, what new uses have since arisen, by what processes and when: (2) to illustrate these facts by a series of quotations ranging from the first known occurrence of the word to the latest, or down to the present day; the word being thus made to exhibit its own history and meaning. . . ."

There are two ways open by which this aim can be reached: the one lies through the unlimited field of literature, the other is to be found in lexicographic works of the last three centuries. The editors of the Dictionary have expended a vast amount of labor and used all

3 The oldest inscription I know with the new sign for \bar{o} is that on the Lancaster cross (Stephens ii, 375; iii, 184), which presents a form (\mathfrak{F}) very similar to the ligature conjectured by me above. Another very old inscription, that on the Whitby comb (Stephens iii, 180), has \mathfrak{F} .

reasonable efforts to obtain complete and accurate results from the collaboration of hundreds of literary readers. But not the same care has been bestowed by them on the perusal of old dictionaries and phrase books, and the treatment of a large class of words betrays an oversight of early English lexicography. It almost seems as though the editors had courted a negligent eclecticism and wilful disregard of method.

Among the old dictionaries very frequently quoted by Murray are Huloet, Cockeram, Blount, Phillips, Coles. A few words in regard to each of them are necessary, before the confusion in the Dictionary can be pointed out.

Huloet's *Abecedarium anglico-latinum* appeared in 1552, and marks the beginning of English lexicography. There had, indeed, been printed wordbooks before, but their arrangement and general treatment are such as not to deserve our further consideration. In 1572 an improved edition of it appeared under the title: *Huloets Dictionarie, newely corrected, amended, set in order and enlarged, with many names of Men, Townes, Beastes, Foules, Fishes, Trees, Shrubbess, Herbes, Fruites, Places, Instrumentes etc. And in eche place fit Phrases, gathered out of the best Latin Authors. Also the French thereunto annexed, by which you may finde the Latin or Frenche, of anye Englishe woorde you will. By John Higgins late student in Oxeforde.*

It is a vast improvement on Huloet, having been carried out with greater exactness. Wherein the improvement consists we readily glean from the address to the reader:

"At first I toke this worke of Maister Huloets in hande (gentle Reader) onelye to enlarge, and when I had herein passed some painefull time, I perceyued it almost a more easye matter to make new, then to amende: for there were many such woordes, as eyther serued not for the matter, or were out of vse . . . such woordes as were not sufficient (by consent of authoritye) I eyther displaced, and put farre better in their roumes, or if they were doubtfull, confirmed by sclender authority, or els serued the place but not so fitlye, I gave them an asteriske. . . . And for ye better attayning to the knowledge of words, I went not to the comon Dictionaries only, but also to the authors themselues, and

vsed therein conference with them which wrote particularly of such things, as ye place requyred . . . and finallye I wrote not in the whole booke one quyre, without perusinge and conference of many authors."

Huloet's and Higgins's dictionaries are only incidentally valuable as lexicographical material, since both directed their main attention to Latin; while Higgins also attempted to create a French wordbook for English students.

In 1616 Dr. Bullokar published a small dictionary in which English words are explained in English, and thus laid the foundation for English dictionaries. His *Expositor* does not seem to have had much popularity, although an enlarged edition of it appeared as late as 1719. Seven years later appeared Cockeram's dictionary which bears the following title: *The English Dictionarie: or an Interpreter of hard English words. Enabling as well Ladies and Gentlewomen, young Schollers, Clarkes, Merchants, as also Strangers of any Nation, to the vnderstanding of the more difficult Authors already printed in our Language, and the more speedy attaining of an elegant perfection of the English tongue, both in reading, speaking and writing. Being a collection of some thousands of words, neuer published by any heretofore. By H. C. Gent. London, 1623.* It consists of two parts. The first "hath the choicest words themselves now in vse, wherewith our language is enriched and become so copious, to which words the common sense is annexed." The second

"contains the vulgar words, which whensoever any desirous of a more curious explanation by a more refined and elegant speech shall looke into, he shall there receiue the exact and ample word to expresse the same."

Cockeram's dictionary thus becomes a valuable source of information in regard to words that were commonly used, and those that were affected by the learned. In addition to these categories, he claims to give the "mocke words which are ridiculously vsed in our language" and the "fustian termes, vsed by too many who study rather to bee heard speake, than to vnderstand themselves." Among the several poems addressed to Cockeram in the introduction there are three by the dramatists Ford, Day and Webster, all of

whom praise highly his performance. Day says of him: "Of a rough speech th'ast taught vs all to speake a perfect language," while Ford acknowledges his indebtedness to Cockeram's dictionary and claims that it has gained for the latter a fame "by paths of Art, vntrod before." This important work, which had drawn its information from the best of sources and in turn had served the leading dramatists of his time for a guide, was reprinted in an improved form in 1626 and reached a twelfth edition in 1670.

Blount's *Glossographia* appeared in 1656. As its title indicates, it is "interpreting all such hard words of whatsoever language, now used in our refined English tongue," and was intended to be "very useful for all such as desire to understand what they read." From his sober, unaffected introduction to the reader, we learn that he had collected material for more than twenty years, ransacking books of all descriptions and collecting words used by the different trades.

"Nay, to that pass we are now arrived, that in London many of the Tradesmen have new Dialects; the Cook asks you what Dishes you will have in your Bill of Fare; whether *Olla's*, *Bisques*, *Hachies*, *Omelets*, *Bouillon's*, *Grillades*, *Joncades*, *Fricasses*; with a *Houtgoust*, *Ragoust*, etc. . . . The Shoo-maker will make you Boots, *Whole-Chase*, *Demi-Chase*, or *Bottines*,¹ etc."

He gives only such law terms as he "thought necessary for every gentleman of Estate to understand;" he proceeds in the same way with words referring to the sciences and arts, being careful not to give more than is absolutely necessary. He avoids

"Poetical Stories, as much as I could, since they are not necessary to be understood by the generality. . . . I have likewise in a great measure, shun'd the old Saxon words; as finding them growing every day more obsolete then other. . . . Yet even such of those, as I found still in use, are not here omitted."

¹ Under *bottine* Murray gives: "Adopted in Sc. in 16c., and independently in Eng. in 19th." This is a strange statement in the face of Blount's remark. In the dictionary Blount gives: "*botine* (Fr.), a Buskin or Summer Boot; we otherwise call them Boots with quarters, which have strings and no Spurs, but a heel like a shoo on the out-side." Stranger yet! The word runs through Phillips and Coles. *Demi-Chase* is not at all given in Murray.

So careful is Blount in the selection of his vocabulary that he would not risk recommending neologisms by introducing them in his dictionary: "to many of which I have added the authors' names, that I might not be thought to be the Innovator of them." While perusing the lexicographic works of his predecessors, he has

"taken nothing upon trust, which is not authentick; yet should not I thus adventure to make it publick, but that it also had the perusal and approbation of some very Learned, and my Noble Friends."

This remarkable book which "is chiefly intended for the more-knowing Women, and less-learned Men" appeared in a second edition "more correct; wherein above five hundred choice words are added" in 1661; other editions followed it in quick succession, that of 1681 being the fifth.

Two years after the first appearance of Blount's *Glossographia*, Phillips published his *New World of Words* which contains a much larger vocabulary than the work of any of his predecessors. His dictionary, however, lacks originality being the result of a series of ill digested plagiarisms. Later on he surreptitiously copied Blount's *Dictionary of Law-terms*, and his Latin dictionary rests entirely upon John Milton's *Thesaurus*. In 1673 Blount scoured him in his *A World of Errors in a World of Words*, and in the introduction to Coles' dictionary a few of his most glaring mistakes are shown up, such as his identifying *contemptible* with *contemptuous*, *ingenious* with *ingenuous* and a "thousand more such, which simple Children would be apt to contradict, but Men of Judgement (for whom they were not writ) know where the mistake might lie." In 1778, that is two years after Coles' first edition, there appeared a much enlarged fourth edition of *A New World of Words*, but the mistakes are not eradicated; there were many more editions of this dictionary, but they do not interest us here.

In 1776 appeared *An English Dictionary explaining the difficult Terms that are used in Divinity, Husbandry, Physick, Phylosophy, Law, Navigation, Mathematicks, and other Arts and Sciences. Containing many thousands of Hard Words (and proper names of*

Places) more than are in any other English Dictionary or Expositor . . . by E. Coles, School-Master and Teacher of the Tongue to Foreigners. It is a careful digest of "the whole succession from Dr. Bulloker to Dr. Skinner, from the smallest volume to the largest folio," and contains a great deal of additional matter, the number of words "being raised from seven in th' Expositor (Bullockar's dictionary) to almost thirty thousand here." An unaltered second edition was published in 1677, others following in rapid succession. Coles published in the same year an English-Latin Dictionary, the English vocabulary of which is entirely drawn from his English Dictionary; it enjoyed great popularity and reached an eighteenth edition in 1772.

It is the chief duty of an historical dictionary to quote first editions of lexicographic works, and in the case of words found in later editions, to give the first of a series of editions containing such words. Thus only do we get a more approximate date for the first use of words that cannot otherwise be ascertained. This principle has been grossly violated by Murray. Cockeram's edition of 1626 is generally quoted, although some words, like *alopicke*, *aluated*, *alutation*, *excelcity* are quoted from the first edition, while others, like *essuriate*, *excreate*, *exdecimate* give both 1623 and 1626; none of the later editions are mentioned.²

Blount is quoted in his first 1656 edition; a number of words are mentioned under 1681, such as *coangustation*, *collectitious*, *apornel*, while in a few cases, such as *crabbat*, *curvous*, *dapocaginous*, *denticle*, the date 1674 (4th edition) is given. In other cases we find the compound 1656-1681 which evidently means only these two dates, for nowhere do we come across the important 1661 edition³ in which all these words are to be found. Phillips and Coles are generally quoted in much later editions than the first occurrence of the words.

Much more serious are the omissions of

² Under *ablecticke*, *abligurie*, *alocate*, *abrodictal* and many other words we find Cockeram 1612! what does that mean?

³ Only once, under *erison calf* we find Blount 1661, but unfortunately the word is not in Blount 1661.

first quotations from these easily accessible sources. In Huloet (1572) the following words occur that are marked in Murray as of a later date: *alecost* (1589), *adourne* (—a banquette, *accoustrer vn banquet*;—*shippes, naves expedire*, 1589), *blowbottle* (1580), *bodkyn* (1580, Baret copied the explanation of the last two words from Huloet), *clacke* (rattell that children vse to play withall. *Clquette*, 1611), *endamage* (1593), *exulceratorie* (1727), *exulcerated*⁴ (1576), *fabulosity* (1599).

In Cockeram (1623) the following are found: *abequitate* (1627), *ablepsie* (1652), *compaginate* (1648), *efflagitate* (1641), *emarginate* (1656), *equilibrity* (1644), *ereption* (1633), *evitation* (1626), *exacuate* (1632), *extruction* (1652).

Much larger is the number of words that are mentioned as of a later date than 1661, although they are to be found in Blount's second edition: *abnodate* (1721), *absentaneous* (1721), *actitation* (1742), *adagial* (1677), *adonique* (1678), *amict* (in the sense of 'amice,' 1753), *anteact* (1721), *aepsie* (1678), *apian* (1862), *apollinean* (1663), *atrabilarie* (16725), *aulic* (1701), *aurist* (1678), *autarchy* (1691), *belage* (1678), *bovicide* (1678), *bourgeoisie* (1707), *caret* (1710), *cervine* (1832), *cessor* (a loyterer, 1727), *charientione* (1709), *circensial* (1682), *cronie* (1665), *cucurbite* (a gourd, 1866), *curvous* (1674), *dapocaginous* (1674), *denary* (of or containing ten, 1848), *dendrology* (1708), *effluent* (1726), *electorat* (1675), *electrine* (1677), *elenctic* (1833), *embeuchement* (1844), *emendals* (1692), *engyscope* (1684), *epithalamize* (1802), *epulary* (1678), *epulosity* (1731), *epulous* (1692), *Erastianism* (1681), *eriferous* (1681), *eristics* (1866), *erumnate* (1692).

The following are a few of the words given in Coles 1677 (identical with 1676) edition: *adent*⁵ (1708), *advowee* (1691), *Agonizant* (1721), *altimetrical* (1681), *ampelite*⁶ (1751), *anauntrins* (1691), *astrobolism* (1721), *balneatory* (1731), *bedrawled* (1721), *betty* (1700), *biga* (1850), *bluffer* (1721), *brasset*⁶ (1751), *cameral* (1762), *coangustation* (1681), *coker* (1690), *colibert* (1708), *collectitious* (1681), *combinational* (1681), *comperendination* (1678), *compromisorial* (1681),

⁴ Also given in Huloet 1552.

⁵ Here and under *attiguons bac* Murray quotes Coles 1672; there is no such edition!

*contemeration*⁶ (1692), *cremaster* (1678), *cuculated*⁶ (1737).

Where such negligence is shown in noting dates of first occurrences, it is but natural to find missing many important words. In the following lists hundreds of words, against which any other than an *Historical Dictionary* could raise even a shadow of an objection, are omitted purposely; for example, Murray does not give *Anakim*, although it is to be found in all of the old, and some of the new, dictionaries. This, which in the phrase of Tennyson's "I felt the thews of Annakim," is a good literary word, has been no doubt ostracized by Murray on the ground that it partakes of the nature of a proper noun. Furthermore, that no suspicion of captious criticism may fall on the writer of this article, the words in Huloet and Cockeram are given with their original explanations, while in a few cases etymological and other notes are added in order to forestall any accusation of arbitrariness in those old lexicographers. In giving etymologies and the semasiology of words, recourse ought to be generally taken to lexicographies of contemporaries, however faulty they may be, as their very faulty ideas about Latin or French words may frequently explain the origin of meanings in their English form. This rule has not been adhered to by the *Historical Dictionary*.

The following words, though given in Huloet's 1572 edition, are not to be found in Murray:

ABHOMINED,⁷ Fastiditus. Abhomine, deteste.

First quot. in Murray under *abomine* is 1683.

ABSOYLER, any thing that deliuereth a man, the remedy. Absolutorium. Remede qui deliure, deliurance.

ADUAUNCED⁷ in stomake as properly to have a proud stomake. Elatus, Hault.

ADUAUNCING and hautenes. Fastus . . . Elatio . . . Haultenete.

AFFECTUOUSSE⁷ . . . Voluptabilis . . . Plaisant. Adonne a ses plaisirs mondains.

AMBULATORIE,⁷ or ouermoste parte of a wall, within the battlementes where men may

⁶ Found even earlier in Phillip's first edition 1658; a few others are found in later editions, though preceding Coles, but I have not marked them down.

walke. Procestrum. Du Cange gives under *ambulatorium*: "Est etiam pedatura murorum, seu moenium *περιπατος* . . . nostris *Rempart*." Earliest quot. in Murray is 1623, nor is this specific meaning given.

AMPULLY, largely, nobly, with great magnificence. Probably only another spelling for *amply*, but compare *ampullous*, proud, in Florio (1598) and in Du Cange, where *superbus*, Prov. *ergulhos* is given for it.

BEDLEM BODY,⁷ Lymphaticus. Furieux, hors du sens.

BES MEATE,⁷ or huny sucle. Cerinthe. Herbe nomme Paquette.

CARME,⁷ a tree which the Frenchmen call Carpie. Carpinus. Vne sorte d'arbre Carmie ou charme. Boyer translates *charme* by 'yoke elm.'

CHAUMFERV, or a rabbat. Stria. Chauffrein creux.

CHAUMFREY, or to make foorowes all a longe on a pyller of stone, to wrynkle.

CREPPLE ROUFFE,⁷ Interpensia. Holyoke gives for *interpersiva*: "Certain pieces of timber, cloven boards or stones, which are set in from the corners of the wall, to convey rain water in spouts." Cf. *criplings* in Phillips: "short spars on the side of a house," and Boyer gives for this: "solives, pieux." Neither *crepple rouffe* nor *cripling* is in Murray.

CYME,⁷ Cement, or cyme, wherewith stones be ioyned together in a lumpe. Du Cange gives under *cimentum*: "Chime, pro Ciment, Arenatum, in Charta Petri etc. . . ."

ENDAMAGEABLE (misprint *endamagable*), or hurtfull, Damnosus, Detrimentosus . . . Dommageable. Murray gives the earliest quot. from Webster 1864 with the meaning of 'capable of receiving damage; perishable.' Also found in Holyoke.

EUESING,⁷ or eues setting or trimming. Subgrundatio. This meaning is not given in Murray.

FANTASIED,⁷ or fantasyinge, or hauing mynde to a thing. Animatus. The nearest

⁷ Also given in Huloet 1552.

approach to this meaning in Murray is a quot. from 1883, explained as 'whimsical.'

The number of words omitted from Cocke-ram's 1623 edition is alarmingly large:

ABACTED. Caried away by violence. Given in Blount (who adds: 'or stealth; also deposited,') Coles, Holyoke and Littleton, none of whom mark it obsolete. It is incomprehensible why this should be omitted in Murray, when *abaction* and *abactor* are mentioned.

ADOLESCENTURATE To play the boy, or foole. Cf. Du Cange *adolescentiari*, *νεανίζειν* . . . adolescentum more agere.

ADRUMINGE. Churlish. Adraming in Phillips ('old word') and Cole (obs.). Probably a participle of the OF. verb *aramir*, *arramir*. In Godefroy the meanings: fort, violent, redoutable; rude, sauvage, are given for *arami*, and Du Cange gives copious quotations for *adramire*.

AENEATOR. A trumpeter. Given in Cole. It has the same meaning in Latin (Suetonius).

AMALTHEAN HORNE. Plenty of all things. In Blount (with a full explanation of the origin of the word), Phillips, Cole.

AMATRIX. A shee-paramour. If *advocatix*, *executrix* are given in Murray, why not *amatrix*?

AMONISCORNE. A gemme of a gold colour like a Rams horne, which causeth one to dreame true things. It is evidently one with the Ammon's horn.

AMIT. To send away. Cole: to lose, to pardon.

ANTILOGOMENES. Contradictions.

ASSEDILIE. A bishops pue. Cf. Du Cange: *assidua*, pars interior ædis sacræ ubi altare collocatum est, and *absida*, interdum pro Episcopali sede, quod in medio Absidæ collocari solet.

ATRICKE. An Vsher of a Hall. Given in Phillips and Cole. Formed from Lat. *atrium*, but cf. Godefroy *aitre*, *atre*, etc., portique, porche.

BLEPHARON (misp. *blephoron*) one having great browes and eye lids. In Blount, Phillips, Cole.

BOCCONIE. Payson or Italian figs. Blount

gives: *boccone* (Ital.), a morsel, a good bit; sometimes taken for poison. Also in Phillips and Cole. So, too, Petròcchi gives for *boccone* pillola velenosa, in addition to the usual meaning.

CAELEB. A batchellor.

CANNITICKE HOUSES. Thetched houses.

CASTALIDES. The surname of the Muses.

CERICEAN. A subtle knaue. Evidently misspelled for *ceracean* and of the same origin as *ceratine* (argument of the horns).

CIMBICKE. A misard, or niggard. In Phillips and Cole. Du Canges gives: *cimbices*, minima quæque plurimi facientes, apud Sussannæum in Vocabulario, a Græco *κίμβηξ*, sordidus, tenax et plus æquo parcus.

CLYNOPALV. Ouermuch lechery. In Blount and Cole. Lat. *clinopale* from Greek *κλινωπάλη*.

CREDITOR-CRAZD. Banquerout.

CYRNE. A goblet to drinke wine in. From Lat. *cirnea*, if not related to Eng. *churn*.

DARDANAR. A forstaller. Du Cange gives: *Dardanarii*, *Seplasiarii*, *Pantoplæ*, etc., from which the English meaning is easily developed.

DEDOCEAT. To teach or instruct.

DEFOMICATE. To chip bread, or so. Du Cange gives: *Defomare*, circum secare, dolare, etc.

EBRIOLATE. To make drunke. Littleton gives a Lat. verb *ebriolare*, and an adj. *ebriolatus*.

ECASTOR. By my fay. Murray quotes Cocke-ram's *ecasterly* but not *ecastor*.

ECCLESIASTICUS. Of, or belonging to a preacher. It is not likely that we have here some misprint, since the word is preceded by *Ecclesiasticke*, a preacher, and *ecclesiasticall*, of or belonging to the Church.

EDECIMATE. To chuse out the tenth man. Murray has *edecimation*, but not *edecimate*.

EDOCTRINATION. A teaching. Murray has *edoctriate*, but not *edoctrination*.

EDORMIATE. To sleep out ones fill.

EDURATE. To harden.

EMDELUGED. Drowned.

EMULCT. Milked.

ENDROMITE. An Irish(?) mantle, or some winter garment. Blount, Phillips and Cole have *endromick* with the same meaning; Blount, however, does not say 'Irish.' Cf. *endroma*, *endromes* in Du Cange.

EPHEBEAN. One marriageable at fifteen years. Murray gives the earliest quot. for *ephebe* from 1697, whereas Blount, Phillips and Cole give: *ephiby* a stripping.

EPICARPEAN. A fruit keeper.

EPIGAMIE. An affinity by Marriage. In Blount and Cole.

EPIOEDEAN SONG. A song sung, ere the corps bee buried.

EQUESTER. A place where men may sit to see plays. Littleton: *equestria*, places or seats in the theatre for the gentry to sit in and see shows and plays.

EQUIPMENT. Wages for horse-hire. Littleton: *equimentum*, the hire of a stallion horse, for couering or leaping a mare.

ERATED. Coured with brasse.

ERGASTER. A workhoure.

ERGASTULE. A gayle.

ERRUGE. Rust. In Murray *æруго* with the first date 1753 is given.

EUGENIE. Nobleness. In Blount (nobleness or goodness of birth or blood), Phillips, Cole.

EURYBATIZISE. To steale things in a house.

EXAGOGE. Reuenue.

EXANIATE. To squeeze.

EXAREANATE. To wash off grauell, or sand.

EXCANDENCIE (misprint *excadencie*). Anger which both suddenly cometh and goeth.

EXCALPE. To ingraue.

EXCOLETE. 'Deked.

EXCORE. To flea, or skinne.

EXDORSICATE. To breake the Backe bone.

EXOCULATE. To put out one's eye.

From Blount's second edition (the first is at this moment not accessible to me) a very large number of words is wanting; this is especially to be regretted when we consider the extreme care with which Blount collected his words:

Absolonism, accomodatitious, accort,⁸ acupictor,⁸ addomestique, adecatist, almadarats, alosha⁸ ambiloge, Amphionize, anity, an-

thime, Antigonize, antiprestigation, Apellean, appensor, arbustine, arseverse, Artemisean,⁸ asotus,⁸ astism,⁸ astroarch (not in Phillips or Coles), attraits,⁸ bilinguis,⁸ bovillon,⁸ brian,⁸ bruma, bruyere, campsor, cathedrarius, catholisation, cenatical, cenosity, cepphic (not in Phillips or Coles), ceromattick,⁸ certaminate, cesariated, ceterious, cindalism, circiture, circumstantibus, circunvagant, Cretan, Cretical (the last two not in Phillips or Coles), crinigerous, curricurro,⁸ cynorexie,⁸ dabuze,⁸ dearch, demichace, demonachation⁸ edisserator, egilopical, elacerate, embossement,⁸ emention, enargy, encheson,⁸ enthalamize, entheated, enthysiasmical, epigrammatographer, epiod, epithemetical, epostracism, equidial, equorean,⁸ escambio,⁸ esopical, estiferous, exercitate (verb, not in Phillips or Coles), exharmonians (not in Phillips or Coles), exuge, falcator, falouque.⁸

The following are a few that are given in Coles but not in Murray:

Abderian, abent,⁹ abettator, abintestate,⁹ Abram-Cove, abric, acaid, accodrine, acephalic,⁹ acerate (full of chaffe), adarige, adashed,⁹ ægroting, affidatus, Agathonian,⁹ ale-silver, amblothridium,⁹ anabrochism, anacrisis, andena, andrago,⁹ andromant, anti-axiomatism,⁹ antipagments⁹ antipast,⁹ antis-tæchon, aqua cœlestis,⁹ arborancy, ballmoney, bambalio,⁹ barfee,⁹ barcaria, baude,⁹ beau-pleading,⁹ bedelan, belchier,⁹ bener, besca, bigge (pap or teat) blakes, blower (quean), boa⁹ (swine pox), bostock, bostal, borametsy, boscaria, bosinnus, boveria, brevan, busca, cabanne, chologogon, chronodix,⁹ chrysites, circumfulgent, clermatine, cœnotes, colus,⁹ compar, comparats, concratitious, conditor (a seasoner), configuration,⁹ consputation,⁹ corporeature,⁹ cosmodelyte, cruental, cullo⁹.

It is a disappointment to find that in Murray a majority of technical terms referring to horsemanship and war have been quoted at second hand from Bailey and Chambers, the latter of whom quotes verbatim et literatim from *The Gentleman's Dictionary*, while the first makes ill disguised literal changes. This classical work has served as the basis of some

⁸ Also given in Coles 1677.

⁹ Found earlier in Phillips first edition (1658).

military dictionaries even in our century; its title runs as follows: *The Gentleman's Dictionary in three parts. I, The Art of Riding the great Horse, etc. . . . II, The Military Art, etc. . . . III, The Art of Navigation, etc. . . . Each part done alphabetically from the sixteenth edition of the original French, published by the Sieur Guillet, and dedicated to the Dauphin. With large additions, alterations and improvements, adapted to the customs and actions of the English, and above forty curious cuts, that were not in the original. London 1705.*

From the Publisher's Preface we see that the English terms given in the dictionary are thoroughly reliable and not mere imitations of French words: "In translating this part (the first), we have taken care to do justice to the French, and at the same time to bring it as near to our Jockey Terms, as the nature of the thing would allow." In the following list are not included such words as are purely French in form, although some of them no doubt might have been given:

abate (1721), action,¹⁰ advance fosse,¹⁰ afterward (1867), air,¹⁰ alarm post (1721), anspesade (1751), antestature (1706), apron (1719), appointe (1727), arm (1751), armed,¹⁰ arzel,¹⁰ assembly (1727), aubin (1751), bacule,¹⁰ balotade (1727), bandeleer,¹⁰ banquet (1753), bar (1753), barbe,¹⁰ barepump,¹⁰ barm (1729), barque-longue,¹⁰ battery master,¹⁰ bean,¹⁰ beat (1753), biovac (1706), bleyne,¹⁰ blossom,¹⁰ boar (1731), bouillon,¹⁰ bout,¹⁰ boyau (1847), branch (1838), brassi-court,¹⁰ braye,¹⁰ breast,¹⁰ breastplate (1720), breed,¹⁰ bridge,¹⁰ brigade major (1810), brilliant (1731), bring in (1753), cadence (Bailey), calade (1731), capesquare,¹⁰ capital (1706), carry low,¹⁰ carry well (1829), cavin (1708), chack (1731), chaufrin (1730), channel (1753), chapelet (1753), chaperon,¹⁰ chevalier (1753), chevette (1731), clamptonnier (1731), claye (1708), clift,¹⁰ close,¹⁰ coffer (1727), coffin bone (1720), complement (1708), conductor (1778), cork,¹⁰ cornet (incorrectly treated); couched,¹⁰ countermarked (1727), counterpoise (1727), crack,¹⁰ creat (1730), cric (1874?), croat,¹⁰ cross,¹⁰ crowned,¹⁰ croupade (1849), curb (a tumour),¹⁰ deceive,¹⁰ demigorge (1706), ebrillade (1753), ecaves-sade,¹⁰ echarpe (1772), effect,¹⁰ embrace,¹⁰ empatement,¹⁰ enciente (1708), encraïne (1731),

enfilade (1706), enlarge (1753), entrepas,¹⁰ envelope (1707), ergot (Syd. Soc. Lex.), estrapade (1730), extend,¹⁰ face of a place (1727), face of a gun (1727), falcade (1730), fanion (1706).

It is to be sorely regretted that the *Oxford Dictionary* does not incorporate the results of a thorough study of the old dictionaries, cyclopedias and word books.

LEO WIENER.

Cambridge, Mass.

FINAL -s IN GERMANIC.

THE theory, revived by Hirt, PBB., xviii, 527ff., that in West Germ. final -s as well as -z fell away, seems to be gaining ground. This view is favorably received by Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gram.*, §214. This I consider unproved and improbable.

The state of the case, as it seems to me, is this: Final -s very often became -z by analogy, but never through phonetic change. A -z thus arising disappeared in W. G. the same as an original Germ. -z.

We know that in o-stems in Germ. the nom. sing. should, according to accent, end in -az or -as. As a matter of fact we have no evidence that the nom. sing. ever ended in -as. In O.N. the ending is uniformly -r or its equivalent, and that, too, where we know the final -s was preceded by an accent, as in the preterit participle. Even iā-stems in O.N. assumed r in the nom. sing., as *heidr*. That the same generalization took place in all the W.G. dialects cannot be affirmed positively—unless it is proved that final -s remained—but it is highly probable. It is at least more reasonable to assume such a generalization than to set up a separate phonetic law to account for the disappearance of final -s.

In the nom. plur. there was a singular generalization in O.N. In the W. G. dialects there is variation. This variation is more easily explained by supposing that final -s remains, while final -z falls away, than to assume that final -s also fell away. O.H.G. *tagā*, then, corresponds to O.N. *dagar*, Goth. *dagōs*, as all agree; while O.S. *dagos*, O.E. *dagas* may well represent a Germ. ending -ōs, with-

¹⁰ Not given in Murray.